

<b>Name</b>	Toby Batchelor Batchelor
<b>Email</b>	
<b>A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...</b>	this is our future, our children's future and our children's children's future. To degrade the planet, to lose what makes this beautiful planet beautiful would be human kind's greatest tragedy, and result in the end of life for not only our species, but many many others. Every living being, including the planet is interconnected and we must begin to work with the planet, not against it. We have the opportunity to renew the beauty and wonder that this tiny rock in the middle of the cosmos contains, let's not ruin that opportunity through selfishness and greed.
<b>Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?</b>	The Government should set a target for 2050 in legislation now.
<b>Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?</b>	The most ambitious target: reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050. I also support taking a science-based approach to ensure our efforts to reduce emissions are as impactful as possible: we should aim for negative levels of long-lived gases, while reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels.
<b>Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?</b>	By using domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting).
<b>Q4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?</b>	The 2050 target should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines its long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise the 2050 target in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.
<b>Q5. The Government proposes that three emissions budgets of five years each (i.e. covering the next 15 years) be in place at any given time. Do you agree with this proposal?</b>	yes - I agree with 5-year budgets set 10-15 years in advance, so that 3 are in effect at all times.
<b>Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?</b>	No - emissions budgets should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines their long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise budgets in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.
<b>Q8. Do you agree with the proposed considerations that the Government and the Climate Commission will need to take into account when advising on and setting budgets?</b>	I agree that the Government and the Climate Commission should take the following factors into consideration when advising on and setting budgets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• scientific knowledge regarding climate change</li> <li>• technology relevant to climate change</li> <li>• economic circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on the economy, as well as the competitiveness of particular sectors of the economy</li> <li>• fiscal circumstances and the likely impact of the decision on taxation, public spending and public borrowing</li> <li>• social circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on fuel poverty</li> <li>• energy policy and the likely impact of a decision on energy supplies and the carbon and energy intensity of the economy.</li> </ul>
<b>Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?</b>	Yes - we must learn from the mistakes of the UK's Climate Change Act and specify a strict time frame for producing a plan.

<p><b>Q10. What are the most important issues for the Government to consider in setting plans to meet budgets? For example, who do we need to work with, what else needs to be considered?</b></p>	<p>The Government's policy plans to meet emission budgets should be comprehensive, fair, cost-effective, environmentally sustainable, and reflect a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The policy has to be a polluter pays model. Such an approach delivers significant benefits to best practice that imparts minimal environmental degradation. Correspondingly it will raise the costs faced by the most polluting of industrial or farming practices. The worst firms that rely on tax payer subsidised pollution would be forced to clean up their act, or go out of business.</p>
<p><b>Q11. The Government has proposed that the Climate Change Commission advises on and monitors New Zealand's progress towards its goals. Do you agree with these functions?</b></p>	<p>Yes - the Commission should not be a decision-making body.</p>
<p><b>Q12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?</b></p>	<p>The Commission should advise the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS. It should not make decisions itself with respect to the number of units available in the NZ ETS, or its implementation.</p>
<p><b>Q13. The Government has proposed that Climate Change Commissioners need to have a range of essential and desirable expertise. Do you agree with the proposed expertise?</b></p>	<p>I agree with the following collective expertise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• climate change policy (including emissions trading)</li> <li>• resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution)</li> <li>• te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests</li> <li>• climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori</li> <li>• experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government</li> <li>• risk management</li> <li>• engineering and/or infrastructure</li> <li>• community engagement and communications.</li> <li>• business competitiveness</li> <li>• knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.</li> </ul> <p>I think expertise in public health is also important.</p>
<p><b>Q14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?</b></p>	<p>Yes. This may require a separate adaptation sub-committee within the Climate Commission.</p>
<p><b>Q15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions?</b></p>	<p>I agree with the proposed functions below, but recognise that nuance is required in terms of how local councils are involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a national climate change risk assessment</li> <li>• a national adaptation plan</li> <li>• regular review of progress towards implementing the national adaptation plan</li> <li>• an adaptation reporting power</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q16. Should the Government explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>

## Further comments

The model has to be polluter pays, it is the fairest model. Externalities simply must be accounted for if we truly want to reverse this trend. The most efficient way for this to happen is simply that polluters should pay for the damage they cause, be it dairy, forestry, construction, et al.

It really seems like a no brainer. Why should the tax payer subsidise pollution by private industry? It's simply false economics to consider the profitability of these firms without accounting for the externalities, yet this is too often the norm.

Agriculture has to be included into the ETS. We cannot cop out any of major contributors to climate change here in NZ.

A lot can be learned from the Maori through their culture. Kaitiakitanga - a strong connection between people and everything that inhabits this planet. We need to tip back the balance so that our mokopuna's mokopuna (grandchildren's grandchildren) are able to experience the same awe and wonderment at the natural world as we have been so blessed to have been able to.